

**Minutes**  
**Toll Bridge Advisory Committee**  
**Meeting of August 9, 2002**

**Schedule Changes**

August 16	BART Capacity Enhancements and Seismic Retrofit
August 23 <sup>rd</sup>	County Connection, Caltrans proposal for express bus services.
August 30 <sup>th</sup>	No meeting.
September 6	Dumbarton Rail and Union City Intermodal Station (East Bay commuter rail)
September 13 <sup>th</sup>	Project presentations from S.F. MUNI, Golden Gate and AC Transit.
September 27 <sup>th</sup>	Project presentation on Transbay Terminal; Caltrain Baby Bullet; Dumbarton West service.

**Project Presentation: Water Transit Authority**

Steve Castleberry of the WTA provided an overview of the analysis and recommendations of the WTA for new and expanded ferry services in the region. Ferry routes recommended for expansion and implementation include:

- Vallejo to San Francisco (service expansion)
- Antioch, Pittsburg, Martinez to San Francisco
- Hercules, Rodeo to San Francisco
- Richmond to San Francisco
- Berkeley/Albany to San Francisco
- Oakland/Alameda to San Francisco (service expansion)
- Harbor Bay to San Francisco (service expansion)
- South San Francisco to San Francisco
- Redwood City to San Francisco
- Treasure island to San Francisco
- Larkspur, Sausalito to San Francisco (service expansion)
- Port Sonoma to San Francisco (study only)

For full implementation of the recommended improvements, the WTA identified a need for \$184 million for capital purposes and \$40 million annually for operating purposes from new toll revenues. It is recognized that the WTA plan will be adjusted on a route by route basis in accordance with available resources and that local contribution will substantially reduce required subsidies from toll revenues.

The Committee had a number of comments and questions regarding the presentation, summarized as follows:

- The analysis comparing the cost effectiveness (subsidy per rider) of each proposed ferry route to a proposed express bus service requires further validation in light of additional proposals to be made regarding an express bus network. It was agreed that a comparison of the effectiveness and cost effectiveness of express buses would be made to ferry or other proposed services as part of the on-going project evaluation process.
- It was noted that the ridership and cost information regarding bus and rail services presented in the analysis ( Transit Industry Standard Measures of Effectiveness ) needs to be reviewed and corrected. WTA staff indicated that they would update the information in the presentation.
- It was requested that information be provided regarding the projected 2025 increase in trips for the recommended ferry services as compared to the projected increase in all transit trips for 2025.
- Concerns were raised that based on the data presented that implementation of the proposed new/expanded ferry services could reduce ridership on BART, depending on the degree of parking constraints at BART. It was discussed that freeing up capacity on the BART system with alternative services could likely be a positive outcome. However, the impact of proposed services on other transit programs needs to be reviewed as part of the project evaluation process.
- It was noted that based on earlier discussion of the Committee, project sponsors should propose projects that are sustainable (i.e. include required capital replacement) from requested toll funding and not from other sources, which could potentially be used for other purposes. The federal discretionary program would be a possible source of funds, however, the plan should be sustainable in the absence of the award of such funds.

### **Preliminary Project Evaluation**

Key elements in describing and defining proposed projects include the following:

- Route
- Headways/Headway reduction
- Nexus with bridge/bridge corridor

- Requested Subsidy for tolls
  - Annual operating subsidy
  - Capital subsidy (rolling stock, facilities, etc.)
- Ridership
- Infrastructure requirements and costs

It was agreed that the project submittals and presentations should focus on these elements in describing proposed projects when applicable. It was also discussed and agreed that in many cases it does not make sense to segment a project into specific routes because some projects (e.g. bus services) are proposed and operate as an integrated network of services.

Key project evaluation factors that in general will be applied (as applicable) to all project submittals include the following:

- Nexus — does project impact a bridge and/or bridge corridor
- % of Nexus — percentage of funds requested for a project as a percent of the total funds generated from the bridge/bridge corridor impacted by that project.
- Cost Effectiveness
- Congestion Relief
- Connectivity
- New Riders — number of riders attracted from autos, rather than other transit services
- Land Use — impacts on land use and/or benefits to land use (e.g. fosters transit oriented developments)
- Environmental Impacts - air quality, water quality, etc.
- Red Flags (Readiness) — major impediments to implementation of the proposed project

Questions were raised whether the evaluation factors are weighted. It was stated that at this time the evaluation are not proposed to be weighted. However, it could be found that a project performs so poorly on an evaluation factor (e.g. cost effectiveness or readiness) that the project is not deemed feasible or desirable. It was discussed and agreed that evaluation factors pertaining to 1) social equity, 2) safety and 3) length of trip be added.

As an example of the application of the evaluation factors, Ezra Rapport preliminarily evaluated the ferry routes proposed by the WTA. A summary of the general findings of this preliminary evaluation were as follows:

<b>Evaluation Factor</b>	<b>Preliminary Finding</b>
Nexus	In general most of the proposed routes had a strong nexus to a bridge or bridge corridor. The routes with the weaker nexus included routes between South San Francisco and Redwood and downtown San Francisco.
Cost Effectiveness	In general the routes proposed appeared to be cost effective. The proposed routes between Redwood City and San Francisco and

	<p>Hercules/Rodeo to San Francisco were not as cost effective as the other proposed routes.</p> <p>As part of the cost effectiveness evaluation, it was discussed whether feeder buses to terminals should be included in the project costs for ferry services. The point was made that all existing ferry services have feeder bus services and that feeder buses were assumed as part of the patronage projections for the ferry services. However, in some cases, the feeder service provided did not substantially impact ridership. It was agreed that this issue needs to be further assessed as projects are evaluated. Further, local subsidy contributions to the individual routes and terminals will be considered in the overall cost effectiveness category.</p>
Environmental	<p>It was noted that an Environmental Impact Report needed to be prepared for the expanded ferry services. It was also noted that the new ferry services would need to meet air quality/emission standards and that mitigations would need to be examined and implemented for any environmental impacts to the Bay caused by the increased ferry services. It was further noted that a route from Berkeley would require dredging in the Berkley terminal area. It was also noted that the proposed routing between Port Sonoma and San Francisco needs additional study to more fully its potential environmental impacts.</p>
Red Flags	<p>Potential implementation issues were discussed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Antioch/Pittsburg/Martinez — terminal locations need to be identified</li> <li>• Berkeley/Albany — development/cost sharing of landside facilities</li> <li>• Treasure Island — development timeline</li> </ul>